DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 753 SP 006 879

AUTHOR	Pitman, John C.
TITLE	Summary of Actions Taken by Selected States Involved in Developing Competency-Based Certification Systems.
INSTITUTION	New England Program in Teacher Education, Durham, N.H.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	29p.; NEPTE Working Paper
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; Consortia; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Criteria; Performance Specifications; *State Boards of Education; *Systems Development; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews actions taken by selected states as they move to implement competency-based teacher education and certification systems (CBTE-CBC). Following a brief discussion of the role of the state in developing CBTE-CBC, three major issues are presented: a) the type of consortium procedures used, b) the manner in which competencies are to be stated, and c) the evaluation of these competencies. Specific examples from varicus states are presented. General conclusions are also presented, focusing on the states' use of decentralized options applied through some type of consortium. A six-page selected bibliography is included. (BRB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

NEPTE Working Paper

- 1973

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY SELECTED STATES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING COMPETENCY-BASED CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by: John C. Pitman
Assistant Director
New England Program
in Teacher Education

August, 1973

New England Program in Teacher Education

Pettee Brook Offices, Durham, New Hampshire 03824

SP 006 879

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY SELECTED STATES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING COMPETENCY-BASED CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

In September, 1972, John Pitman was appointed as a NEPTE Field Agent in Rhode Island. His area of expertise is Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certification. Since that time NEPTE has received several requests for information regarding these topics. This paper is an attempt to review actions taken by selected states as they move to implement competency-based teacher education and certification (CBTE-CBC). The writer briefly discusses the central question: "What is the role of the state?" He then discusses three major issues central to CBTE-CBC development and gives examples of how various states have attempted to resolve these issues. The three issues are: (1) What type of consortium procedures will be used, (2) How will competencies be stated, and (3) How will competencies be evaluated.

Roland Goddu

Director

New England Program in Teacher Education

August 1973

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY SELECTED STATES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPING COMPETENCY-BASED CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

It is most difficult to develop a comprehensive list of all the questions that could or even should be raised about competency-based certification systems. The purpose of this summary is to review the actions of certain states in terms of the way they resolved selected key questions and issues. A much more detailed study of all aspects of certification should be conducted before any final operational plans are developed for a given state. Certification directors in those states who have made the most progress in developing CBC systems were contacted. In the remainder of this report the information received from the selected states will be analyzed.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE STATE?

In the past two years, three major survey's of the fifty (50) states have been made to determine what was the state of CBC. One of these, Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene by Allen A. Schmieder, is not included here. The other two surveys were made by Robert Roth, New Jersey State Department of Education, and by Ted Andrews, Director of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education.

A review of these surveys shows that over thirty states are interested in CBTE - CBC. Andrews notes that the states are moving in two primary directions: (1) the use of approved programs, and (2) the development of specific performance criteria for certification.

CENTRALIZATION VS. DECENTRALIZATION:

WHAT POWER FOR THE STATE?

The reader may wonder what this topic has to do with a summary of state actions on CBC systems. It is, in fact, the basic question which largely determines what type of operational guidelines will be developed and implemented by a given state since it establishes the philosophical base for the guidelines. The model used to illustrate this issue was developed by Robert Roth and substantially modified by Ted Andrews.

A given state could theoretically leave all of the decision-making in terms of certification to others -- be at a zero 0 point on a continuum. In this case there would be complete decentralization of state power. A given state could, again theoretically, control all the decision-making in terms of certification -- be at a 100 point on a continuum. In this case there would be a complete centralization of state power. To date, no state is at a 0 or 100 point on a continuum. The Roth-Andrews Model below, shows how one might categorize actions of states on a continuum.

Roth-Andrews Model

Degree of State Control over Certification					
0	5	40	60	75	95 100
Information on CBTE given to any who request.	College developed, approved program approach.				
	Consortia required, but no set competencies or evaluation criteria -- operational guidelines for consortia increase as one moves from 5 - 60.	State now adds generic teacher competencies and other evaluative criteria.	State sets all competencies and evaluative guidelines but, evaluation done by institution.	State now establishes all evaluative criteria and actually evaluates candidates.	

As can be seen in the foregoing model, practically all states do use some type of approved program model and require a consortium of some type to develop a given approved program. Further, it is obvious that the two key issues (in terms of control) are: (1) the establishment of competencies, and (2) the establishment and operation of evaluative criteria and procedures. In a very real sense, the party or parties who have the legal right to set and evaluate competencies have actual control over the system. It is highly unlikely that any state will take a strictly informational route, if only because such a choice would require considerable expenditure of public funds with no concomitant control or accountability. It is possible, but not probable, that a state would in time develop the capability to operate its own evaluation centers which would, in effect, give the state total control over the system. It is not probable at this time because the means (instruments) for evaluating certain competencies are primitive; and, also, there is little concensus among groups as to how evaluation should be conducted. There is also much debate over what profile of competencies constitutes the "effective" teacher. However, it is possible for political pressure to cause a state to attempt to move to the 100 point.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED STATES' ACTIONS

This analysis is based on four general types or categories of questions or issues. The four general categories are:

1. Consortium Procedures -- What groups or agencies should be involved in the development of a CBTE-CBC system?
2. Establishment of Competencies -- Who should define the competencies and to what degree of completeness?

3. Evaluation of Competencies -- Who should evaluate the competencies and what level or levels of evaluation (levels of certification) should be set?
4. Management Procedures -- What type of management procedures are required?

Certainly, many sub-questions could be asked under each of the four basic categories. The purpose here is to survey a number of alternatives employed by various states as they dealt with each of the four general issues. If a given state should decide to begin developing a CBC system, all of the alternatives discussed briefly here should be investigated in much greater depth before proposing a particular plan. In brief, the following review is an outline of actual operational alternatives currently being tested or proposed.

CONSORTIUM PROCEDURES

All states currently fall into the 5 - 95 per cent range on control by the state of certification. All also utilize some type of a consortium for developing approved CBTE - CBC systems. The key points here are: (1) What groups are required to participate in the consortia -- if indeed they are required?, and (2) How circumscribed are the operations of a given consortium?

The following review is based on fifteen states. Twenty (20) states were surveyed, five (5) of them had not passed the initial investigation stage.* Of the fifteen (15) who had proposed or actual plans, twelve (12) listed the groups to be included in a consortium. Three others used a consortium in limited ways or implied such usage.

*States surveyed but not yet past the investigation stage - South Dakota, Tennessee, Colorado, Wisconsin, Louisiana.

Groups Participating in Consortia

The following table shows the various consortium groups included by selected states. The last three columns show whether there are levels of consortia required, i.e. local consortia and statewide consortia; and whether the actual numbers of the representatives are stipulated.

	Groups Represented													
State	T.	P.A.	I.H.E.	Adm.	Stu.	Citizen	Other	S.D.E.	S. Bd.	S.B.E.	Local & State Consr.	No. Stip. Local Level	No. Stip. State Level
Arizona	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	L&S		X
California	X	I	X	I	X						L		
Connecticut	X	I	X	X	I	I					L		
Florida	X	I	X	X				X			*L&S		
Georgia	X	I	X	X				X			L		
Illinois	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		L&S		
Michigan	X	I	X	X							L		
Minnesota	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		L&S	X	X
New Jersey	X	I	X	X	X		X	X			S		S
New York	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				L		
North Carolina	X	X	X	X				X			L		
Oregon	X	X	X	X	X						L	Equal	
Texas	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	L&S		X
Vermont	X	I	X	X						X	L		
Washington	X	X	X	I	I	I					L		

I = by implication, or not strictly defined beyond a general statement of intent, i.e. each group should involve sub-groups.

* Really a special case as consortia really largely used to develop general state support materials and SDE and IHE the thrust.

As can be seen from a review of the above table, ALL states involve the local education agencies (LEA's) and college and university teacher education personnel. The categories, teacher (T), professional association (PA), and administrators (Adm) really constitute the major units within an LEA. Though only eight states directly mentioned professional associations

this is clearly implied by the category teachers since practically all teachers belong to one of the two major national associations (NEA or AFT). When a state has active membership in two or more teacher associations, the guidelines generally recognize both specifically rather than simply stating general teacher representation.

Further, student and citizen representation is only noted by about half of the states. Two other categories, state department of education (SDE) and state board of education (SBE) may be a bit misleading. All states with both local and state level consortia (5 states) have SDE and/or SBE representation. Probably SDE representation is greater than the table indicates because the state ultimately approves consortium action. However, it is clear that many states are taking a somewhat decentralized position and allowing considerable local flexibility in terms of CBTE development. It is also interesting to note that only one state formalized the actual numbers of representatives at a local level and that state (Minnesota) uses the local consortia to evaluate inservice recertification.

Conclusion:
1. The basic consortium units are LEA personnel (teachers and administrators), IHE (institution of higher education) and representatives from professional associations.
2. Most states leave consortium operations to local units with only general groups defined.
3. Where state level consortia are utilized, the base of representation becomes much broader and more highly specified.

Consortium Operation

As noted in the preceeding section, most states allow considerable flexibility for consortia. However, it is clear from reviewing consortium procedures that some states have developed quite elaborate and sophisticated guidelines for consortium operation. The following examples will show some of the alternatives now being utilized.

Texas - State Wide Plan with a Hierarchy of Consortia

Texas mandates parity at all levels. There is at the state level a State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education. This is a 27 member board broadly representative of all groups (primarily the IHE's, LEA's and various Professional Associations). This board has the legal authority to recommend policy and to review plans from local consortia. Also, at the state level there is a 30 member state commission for Professional Competencies. It is also broadly based and is charged with studying CBTE and making program and policy recommendations. In effect it is an advisory or support group to the Board of Examiners.

The operational units are the Local Cooperative Teacher Education Centers. These groups (17 in 1973) actually develop CBTE programs according to state guidelines and are composed of IHE personnel, LEA personnel and professional association personnel. The IHE has the initiative responsibility and the IHE develops a contractual agreement with the LEA and PA components. More than one IHE or LEA may be involved, but one must be designated primary agent. The foregoing system is one in which consortia are directly linked to higher level state consortia. The entire state operation is based on broad-based consortia.

Washington - Decentralized with Highly Specified Process Guidelines

Washington is committed to local consortia. There are presently about 68 separate consortium working on CBTE programs. The entire operation, planning, implementation and evaluation is to be done by the consortium with equal representation from all groups. One group is to be designated as the agency primarily responsible for the consortium. The state guidelines require an eight (8) phase developmental process: (1) consortium formation,

(2) establishment of a policy board, (3) adoption of policies, (4) program development, (5) state board approval, (6) program implementation, (7) certification, and (8) evaluation. The state has developed a series of matrices suggesting what responsibilities the respective consortium members should have during each phase. In brief, the process standards are very comprehensive, but the goals and competencies of each consortium are very open. The state views its role as providing the supportive means rather than directing even limited program ends. In fact, no actual college degree is required for certification. As of now (May 1973) no program has as yet been put into operation. It remains to be seen how well such a highly decentralized approach will work.

Arizona - Focus on Recertification

In this state efforts have been directed totally at recertification. The assumption seems to be that real change comes after one has taken a teaching position. A state task force is being used to establish recertification criteria. This is a broadly-based 37 member group. It is related to local consortia whose job it is to establish particular competencies and evaluation procedures based on state criteria. The interesting thing here is that parents and students must be on the local consortia.

Florida - State Wide Support - Limited Consortia

Florida has made a massive effort to develop support in terms of catalogues of competencies and instructional materials. The assumption is that these things are necessary if a CBTE system is to succeed. Consortia, primarily IHE consortia, have been used to develop the necessary materials. In-service training is also a major thrust. Here various LEA's in cooperation with IHE's have developed instructional programs and materials. To date the

program is viewed as an alternative route. Now that materials are largely developed and/or catalogued, efforts to develop state guidelines for implementation are the major focus.

Vermont - Total Local Control

Vermont has developed guidelines for LEA consortia. The unique feature is the consortia may develop pre-service programs as well as in-service programs and recommend the issuance of certificates. Once a plan is developed a majority of the LEA's teachers and its school board must approve the plan and the LEA administrators must endorse the plan. Finally, an IHE must participate in the plan and the plan must contain a balance between in-service workshops and on campus academic experiences. In effect, the LEA can become the approved program agent. This does not preclude the operation of approved programs at colleges and universities, but is does provide a meaningful local option.

Minnesota - Evolutionary Approach and Renewal Units

This optional program focuses primarily on in-service and continuing certification. Various levels of certification have been established. Colleges and universities are encouraged to develop experimental CBTE programs, but all recertification is based on renewal units which are performance based. The basic notion is that various in-service activities are worth so many renewal units. A teacher is required to earn 120 renewal units over 5 years. At the state level there is a State Committee for Programs Leading to Renewal of Continuing Certificates In Education. This is an 8 member committee with representatives from the two teachers associations (NEA-AFT), state school boards assn., state school adminis-

trators assn., state teacher education council, and the state department of education. It is a policy review and appeal body. Each LEA has a local committee composed of 4 teachers and 2 administrators elected by their respective peers, and a citizen appointed by the school board. In a sense, this approach is similar to Arizona's but specified in greater detail.

Other Options

Task Forces - Some states are using broadly based "consortium-like" task forces to develop state plans. (Georgia, New Jersey, Illinois)

Local Consortia-Partial - Some states have passed various legislative mandates for local districts to establish competencies and/or evaluation plans, but have given them no real support or guidelines. (California, Connecticut)

New York - Here CBTE is being developed by pilot projects governed by consortia and operating under general process guidelines. At present, New York has 13 pilot projects. Each consortium must include a cooperative policy board which is responsible for developing monitoring and evaluating the pilot programs according to four major process guidelines.

University focused - some states have used ad hoc committees to develop guidelines for CBTE programs and have then left it up to colleges and universities to develop programs according to such guidelines. (Michigan and North Carolina) In these cases the programs are identified as alternatives and some type of consortia is required during program development phases.

Summary

Consortium usage is widely varied in the respective states. The number and type of representation varies. The degree of operational specification varies. A key difference would seem to be the amount of decentralization

allowed by a state. This is not necessarily a function of operational specification, i.e. procedures can be highly specific but the goals or ends left very open (Wash.). On the other hand, the operational specifics may be minimal but the goals or ends quite specific (North Carolina). Perhaps the point here is that the development of consortium procedures and the development of competency guidelines are related but separate issues. How then have states approached the question of guidelines for competencies?

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPETENCIES

The primary question here is who is to define competencies and to what extent. Again, the role of the state is a critical factor in determining the procedures to be employed. States operating on a decentralized basis generally leave specification of competencies to a given consortium. Those opting for more centralized state control tend to define statewide competencies which may be general (generic or area competencies) or quite comprehensive and specific. The inservice--preservice question also enters here. Pre-service competencies tend to be more frequently specified than in-service competencies.

Approaches Used

Florida - Here the state has identified courses necessary for certification and then has compiled a catalogue of competencies to be validated by research (field tests of competencies). These competencies are provided to colleges in order to facilitate their program development efforts. Secondly, the state has developed a catalogue of training materials on CBTE. Each IHE can select what it wants--the whole operation is seen as facilitating alternate routes to teacher education and certification. The same materials are

available to LEA's as they develop master plans for inservice re-certification based on performance criteria. In essence, the entire Florida education system will develop on a competency-based model, but the IHE's and LEA's are free to select those competencies they wish from the extensive support materials available at the state level. The role of the state is cleraly facilitative not directive even though all must develop competency-based programs.

North Carolina

Here statewide ad hoc committees under the State Advisory Council on Teacher Education and staff development were used to develop a comprehensive catalogue of competencies and operational guidelines for the various curricular leading to various certificates. They note that:

> In development of programs, each curriculum is expressed in terms of competencies and guidelines which give direction to the nature, scope, sequence and relative emphasis to the parts of which it is composed.

This catalogue was adopted by the State Board of Education, Sept. 1972. Two types of program development options are allowed and both must use the comprehensive guidelines. First, an IHE may develop an experimental program based on the guidelines. Secondly, a consortium may be formed composed of an IHE, LEA and representatives from professional associations and the state education agency. This group also must develop its program according to the state guidelines. In a very real sense North Carolina is employing a quite centralized route for program development.

Utah - This state too is using a highly centralized approach to competencies. To date one complete set of criteria (Instructional Media) has been approved. Others are currently under development. These criteria are totally specified

down to the smallest sub-objectives. The IHE's still have the responsibility for evaluation, but the criteria are specific enough to suggest appropriate evaluation. When this state completes all areas it will likely be the most centralized example of state level competencies.

New Jersey - Here a massive use of task forces has been utilized. There are 16 state-wide task force groups, one for each certification area. The objective of the respective task forces is to develop a list of competencies for each of the areas. These competencies will provide the basis for a state-wide model for competency-based certification. Each task force is composed of 17 members;

> 4 classroom teachers, 1 department head or supervisor, 2 college personnel from the education area and 2 from the liberal arts staff, 1 state department curriculum specialist, 4 administrators with general curriculum experience, 1 measurement and evaluation specialist, 1 director of student teaching, 1 college student.

Minnesota - This state also uses task forces with wide representation to develop competencies in various certification areas. The operation of the task force is directed by state level program development guidelines. To date proposed competencies have been developed for (1) social studies, (2) school administration, (3) science teachers 5-9th grade, and (4) science teachers 7-12th grades. However, the "competencies" are most general--almost a listing of educational goals in the areas.

Michigan - There are state-wide guidelines in reading and mathematics. However, a given IHE is free to develop its own competencies. The major role of competencies comes from college programs in the various subject areas.

Others - The other states in the survey group take a more decentralized approach to competencies. Texas and Arizona do have state level groups working to develop lists of competencies which may or may not become mandated at a state level. The other states (Washington, Oregon, Illinois, California, Connecticut, New York, Vermont) establish various process guidelines for consortia but leave the establishment of competencies to a given consortium. California has listed what might be termed generic competencies but they are certainly not stated in measurable terms.

Summary - A very few states (North Carolina, Utah, Florida, New Jersey) have made very serious attempts to develop rather complete lists of competencies. Yet even here only Utah has, to date, actually required a set of competencies in a given certification area (New Jersey probably will and North Carolina's competencies though stated as "Guidelines" are being taken as fixed). Apparently, states have not wanted to become too specific. This is certainly in line with the recognized problem of validating a given competency and gaining acceptance of a set of competencies. At this state in the development of competencies it is probably wise to allow considerable flexibility in the establishment of competencies and to concentrate on defining operating procedures for consortia that will insure that competencies are reasonably derived. If more data (information on the effect of given competencies) is generated by the states, it may become possible to more clearly define basic teacher competencies. However, it is very clear that few states want to accept such a responsibility at this state of CBTE development.

Evaluating Competencies

A review of the "state of the art" on CBTE evaluation procedures quickly leads one to conclude that this is the area of greatest weakness. There is a pressing need for careful research that will help generate CBTE - CBC evaluation instruments and procedures. A review of the states in this survey shows the need for such efforts.

It is also in this area that the greatest resistance from organized teacher associations (NEA and AFT) is encountered. Both major teacher associations have supported CBTE (they refer to PBTE but I am using CBTE as a synonymous term here), but have come out against competency-based or performance-based certification. Probably their primary objective involves the evaluation of selected competencies. Let us assume, for the sake of simplicity, that a consortium was used which was broadly based and that all consortium representatives agreed on a given set of competencies. How are the competencies to be assessed? The persons or agency that is the legal authority to award credentials based on whatever evaluations are used really controls the system. This fact becomes particularly critical during the inservice portions of teacher certification. So long as a CBTE program is directed at pre-service competencies there is relatively little objection. However, after initial certification teachers believe the LEA (more particularly the teachers) should have primary evaluative responsibility. Then the question of "how will a teacher be observed" is central. There must be some protections built into the system to reduce any arbitrary actions by evaluators. This in turn is partly a function of the evaluation instruments and techniques available. In brief, the lack of validated observational techniques and

procedures makes specific evaluations difficult. A paradox of sorts is generated. Competency-based certification necessitates specific evaluation of competencies selected which is certainly better, in terms of the value of data collected, than vague and global measures. Less vague measures should be less subject to subjective judgements and arbitrary decisions. However, as one develops more specific competencies and consequently focuses evaluations the more important the selection of competencies becomes. True, there will be less subjectivity in an operational sense, but then the arguement centers over what competencies should be evaluated. In effect the argument shifts from the actual measurement techniques employed to more general value questions which may be extremely subjective. If the foregoing is valid, a major implication is that effective use of broadly based consortia is essential for developing a consensus on values so that evaluation procedures can be developed from a common value base.

New Jersey - Model Development through State Conferences

The New Jersey strategy is to systematically collect comments and reactions to models presented at "Listening Posts" (statewide conferences). In May (1973) various professional organizations in the state will be asked to submit formal position statements prior to a conference and to then discuss a model for the implementation of a performance-based teacher certification system based on criteria (competencies) developed by the 16 task forces. The specific topic of the May conference will be methods and procedures for applying a set of performance criteria to evaluate a candidate for certification. Models presented and discussed at the conference are to be synthesized and a model(s) distributed for reaction. Feedback, (reactions to model(s)) will be used to develop a final model(s) which will then be field tested. Field test data will be used to develop a proposal for state approval.

North Carolina - Assigned Evaluation Responsibilities Within Consortia

This state is typical of many other states in that it has developed process guidelines for evaluation, but has not specified any mechanics (how or what will be done). There are four required consortia groups (Local Education Agency, Institution of Higher Education, Professional Association Representatives, State Education Agency). Each has a general responsibility as follows:

1. Professional Associations-coordinator of evaluation related to field experiences.
2. Local Education Agency-coordinator of assignments to field experiences.
3. Colleges and Universities (IHE)-coordinator for implementation and evaluation of preparation programs.

Further, the North Carolina guidelines state that a consortium plan, "must develop indicators as evidence of acceptable entry into a program and identify levels of expected competency throughout."

Other states such as Oregon, New York, Vermont and Washington have written general process guidelines for consortia to follow in terms of program evaluation. Typically, they concentrate on roles and responsibilities of the groups in the consortia. Washington has developed a rather complete matrix (see consortium section for more detail).

General Responsibility - Institutions of Higher Education

These states have very general consortium guidelines and place the primary responsibility for evaluation of competencies on the IHE's. A typical statement would be one such as in Florida, the IHE must identify the procedures by which their set of competencies are to be measured. Control is in the college with direction established by the state. Utah has, as noted earlier, begun to develop comprehensive competencies, but left evaluation up to the IHE's. A unique feature here is that a candidate can request a test when he is ready. He can have competencies

tested one at a time or all at once. No set program is required to achieve state competencies, but candidates must have a bachelors degree. Minnesota and Michigan hold the IHE's responsible for pre-service evaluation (initial certification) but then turn to the LEA for inservice evaluation (see consortium section for details on Minnesota's renewal unit system).

General Responsibility - Local Education Agency

In these states evaluation is the primary responsibility of local consortia which usually means the local education unit (teachers and administrators). Texas operates out of its local centers which means that the policy board of each center set up the evaluation design (see consortium section for details). Arizona and California simply say the local committee or LEA must develop an evaluation plan but don't specify how this is to be done. Connecticut also makes evaluation a local responsibility, but directs evaluation to various levels of certification which are tied to an internship program. Under this plan, the first year of teaching (internship) is tied to a special certificate. If the local committee feels the internship was successful (local criteria) the teacher is given a provisional certificate. After 5 or 6 years another local evaluation is made leading to a standard certificate. Apparently, all evaluations are tied to local developed inservice programs and criteria. Illinois is similar to Connecticut in that they have levels of certification (Initial with a 3 year maximum time limit) continuing awarded after being in a local inservice program five year life, and continuing renewals every five years. The difference is that they spell out who will do the evaluations..."by a group of persons, the majority of whom are peers of the individual being evaluated... specified procedures subject to appeal."

Summary

As one moves from consortia and management procedures to establishment of competencies to evaluation of selected competencies, the amount of operational detail reduces sharply. It is most difficult to suggest even tentative conclusion on evaluation approaches. However, the following ideas do seem to hold:

1. Only four states (New Jersey, Utah, Florida, and North Carolina) seem to be at a point where specific evaluative criteria might be developed for existing state level competencies.

2. Most states, recognizing the lack of hard evaluative techniques and/or instruments, leave actual evaluation design up to consortia or local administrative units under varying levels of process guidelines developed at the state level.

3. Generally evaluation of pre-service CBTE programs is made a primary responsibility of an IHE with varying degrees of cooperative action by other agencies required.

4. Generally evaluation of inservice CBTE programs is made a primary responsibility of an LEA with varying degrees of cooperative action by other agencies. (Note: LEA is operationalized to mean teachers, administrators and representatives of professional associations at the district level).

5. The degree of specificity in state plans even at a process level is greater for pre-service evaluation than for inservice evaluation.

WHAT WE HAVE SAID

Overall generalizations are even more difficult and subjective then was the case in foregoing section summaries. However, an attempt will be made to synthesize the foregoing.

1. States do have to decide whether or not they want a relatively decentralized or relatively centralized system for CBTE-CBC.

2. If a state opts for a relatively decentralized system they must be willing to accept many possible definitions of pre-service and inservice programs. Further, state guidelines will have to be process oriented with fairly open goals or ends.

    a. Wide representation must be guaranteed and parity among consortium groups must be protected.

b. If competencies are stated at all at the state level they should be generic (minimal specification).

c. Evaluation must be largely left to the consortia.

3. If a state opts for a relatively centralized system they must be willing to establish at least generic competencies in the various certification areas and to develop evaluation criteria for the stated competencies and procedures for overall program evaluation.

   a. Wide representation through task forces or committees will be needed to develop the competencies and overall program models.

   b. Considerable support in terms of money, personnel and materials must be made available, especially if the state decided to mandate its program. This means CBTE-CBC must be given a high state priority.

4. A state may decide to try to concentrate on only pre-service aspects of CBTE-CBC. Again, the state may opt for a decentralized or centralized approach in which case items under #2 and #3 will apply.

   a. Evaluation will probably be less debated since the IHE will likely b primarily responsible. The basic change is that evaluation will switch from course objectives to specific competencies.

   b. Also, evaluation based on consequences (student learnings) is not a factor prior to actual classroom teaching.

   c. It may be easier to establish competencies and evaluation procedures. Also, only initial certification would be affected.

5. A state may decide to concentrate on only inservice aspects of CBTE-CBC. Again the state may opt for a decentralized or centralized approach. However, in this case certification categories and evaluation procedures will be directly affected.

   a. In a decentralized approach, a broadly based consortium would be established and primary responsibility would fall on the LEA.

      1. Evaluation procedures would vary but be in the hands of LEA teachers and administrators.

      2. Inservice programs would be developed in terms of performance criteria and probably involve workshop and IHE academic experiences.

b. In a centralized approach some type of state level consortium with broadly based representation would be required to establish guidelines for inservice activities and evaluative criteria.

   1. Probably local evaluative teams or groups would have to be established to insure acceptable teacher and administrator representation. These groups would have to develop the specific evaluation procedures and instruments. Process guidelines and/or material support from the state could vary.

   2. A key requirement would be statewide consensus on the competencies for given certification levels and on the evaluation procedures to be employed.

   3. Probably some type of hierarchial organization would have to be established to insure that the entire certification process was consistent across districts.

The one general conclusion derived from a review of states' actions in CBTE-CBC system development seems to be that relatively decentralized options are most used and applied through some type of consortia to provide broad based inputs. This approach is probably chosen because it enables a state to better meet area needs. It is also much more defensible given the present scarcity of hard data on the impact of selected competencies and evaluation process for competencies.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list of sources is highly selective. There are literally hundreds of books, reports, articles, and state department papers available. There are also newsletters and working papers available directly from institutions and consortia operating CBTE/PBTE programs. Hopefully this abbreviated listing contains the major documents and a sampling of major groups who might be contacted for more detailed information.

BOOKS AND REPORTS

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and ERIC Clearing House on Teacher Education. Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, August, 1972. (No. 7 in Series)

Anderson, Daniel A., et al. Competency-Based Teacher Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1972.

Andrews, Theodore E. Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/Certification. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April, 1972. (No. 3 in Series)

Arends, Robert L., et al. Handbook for the Development of Instructional Modules in Competency-Based Teacher Education Programs, 2nd ed. Buffalo: State College, Center for the Study of Teaching, 1973 (1st Edition, 1971 -- 2nd Edition is more comprehensive and includes review of comments received pertinent to modules constructed by users of 1st edition).

Baral, David P. et al. A Taxonomy of Teaching Behaviors: Progress Report and Listing and Preliminary Classification of the Item Pool. Stanford Report No. 36, California: Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1968.

Bradley, Ruth, et al. Measuring Teacher Competence: Research Backgrounds and Current Practice. Burlingame: California Teachers Association, 1967.

Broudy, Harry S. A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May, 1972. (No. 4 in Series)

Burdin, Joel L. and Margaret T. Reagan, eds. Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel. Washington, D.C.: Association for Teacher Educators; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1971.

Clegg, Ambrose A. and Anna Ochoa. Evaluation of a Performance-Based Program in Teacher Education: Recommendations for Implementation. Seattle: University of Washington, College of Education, 1970.

Cooper, James, and Wilford Weber. Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, June, 1972. (No. 5 in Series)

Cooper, James, Wilford Weber, and Charles E. Johnson, eds. Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Systems Approach to Program Design. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1972.

DeVault, M. Vere, Dan W. Anderson, and George E. Dickson, eds. Competency-Based Teacher Education: Problems and Prospects for the Decades Ahead. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1972.

Dodl, Norman. The Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education, 1972.

Educational Testing Service. A National Commission on Performance-Based Education: Its Feasibility, Proposed Organization, and Program. A Report to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Frederick J. McDonald, Director. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, Dec., 1972 - Overview Jan., 1973.

Elam, Stanley. Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of The Art? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December, 1971. (No. 1 in Series)

Elfenbein, Iris. Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October, 1972. (No. 8 in Series)

Florida Center for Teacher Training Materials. Catalog: Annotated Listing of Competency-Based Modules. Chipley, Florida: Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, 1972 (P.O. Drawer 190, Area Code 32428)

Florida State Department of Education. The Florida Program for Improving The Training, Evaluation, and Licensure of Educational Personnel. Tallahassee: the Department, 1971.

Gage, N.L. ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963 (Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. R.M.W. Travers, in-press)

Houston, W. Robert. Strategies and Resources for Developing a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program. Albany: New York State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification: Multi-States Consortium on Performanced Based Teacher Education, 1972.

Houston, W. Robert. Resources for Performance-Based Education. Albany: The University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, March, 1973.

Houston, W. Robert, and Robert B. Howsam, eds. Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems and Prospects. Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Johnson, Charles E., and Gilbert F. Shearron. Georgia Educational Model Specifications for the Preparation of Elementary Teachers. Final Report USOE Project No 8-9024. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1968.

Joyce, Bruce, ed. Columbia University Model Program, Final Report USOE Project No. 8-9019. New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1968.

Joyce, Bruce R. The Promise of Performance (Competency)-Based Teacher Education: An Analytic Review of the Literature and Experience. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (in-press)

Joyce, Bruce R., and Masha Weil. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Kay, Patricia M., et al. Performance-Based Certification. New York: City University of New York, Office of Teacher Education, 1971.

Nash, Paul. A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April, 1973 (No. 10 in Series)

National Teacher Corps. Washington, D.C.: Teacher Corps, USOE (instructional materials center in teacher education)

Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative. B-2 Modules. P.O. Drawer, 190, Chipley, Florida (Series of modules one could use in a teacher education program)

Rosner, Benjamin, Ed. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education. (Final Report of the "Outside Track" of Task Force, 1972) Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1972.

Schalock, H. Del, et al., ed. A Plan for Managing the Development, Implementation and Operation of a Model Elementary Education Program. Monmouth, Oregon: Oregon College of Education, 1970.

School Library Manpower Project. Suggestions for Curriculum Content Within Major Areas of Competencies. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

Schmeider, Allen A. Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February, 1973. (No. 9 in Series)

Weber State College. WilKits. Ogden, Utah: College of Education. (50 or so modules used in elementary and secondary education programs)

Weigand, James, ed. Developing Teacher Competencies. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

ARTICLES

Allen, Wendell C., et. al., "Performance Criteria for Education Personnel Development: A State Approach to Standards," The Journal of Teacher Education, Summer, 1969.

Cooper, James M., et al, "Specifying Teacher Competencies," The Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1973.

Daly, Patrick L. "Certification by Performance," Changing Education, 4:23-24; Spring, 1970.

Educational Technology. "Competency-Based Education," November, 1972 (Entire issue devoted to Competency-Based Education).

Fantini, Mario D. "The Reform of Teacher Education: A Proposal for New York State," Phi Delta Kappan, 53: 476-79; April, 1972

Howsam, Robert B. and Association of Classroom Teachers, NEA. "Performanced Based Instruction," Today's Education, 61: 33-40; April, 1972.

Nash, Robert J. "Commitment to Competency: The New Fetishism in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 52: 240-243; December, 1970.

Nash, Robert J. and Russell M. Agne. "Competency in Teacher Education: A Prop for the Status Quo?," The Journal of Teacher Education 22: 147-156 Summer, 1971.

National Education Association. "Evaluation of Teaching Competence," NEA Research Bulletin, 47; 67-75; October, 1969.

Seldon, David. Evaluate Teachers? AFT Qu EST Paper No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1969.

Stiles, Lindley J. "Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts," Phi Delta Kappan, 50: 477-80; April, 1969.

Many dozens of other articles could have been listed. These were selected to show a rough cross-section of topics and interests.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PAPERS

Arizona: (1) Performance Certification, What Is It? Arizona Department of Education, Phoenix, 1972.
(2) Shofstall, W.P., "Ten Assumptions About Performance Based Re-Certification." Arizona Department of Education, Phoenix, 1972.

Arkansas: Proposed Modificationt to Existing Teacher Education Regulations, Arkansas State Board of Education, Little Rock, 1972.

California: Assembly Bill 293 (the Stull Bill), California State Legislature, Sacramento, 197.

Connecticut: PPPBTE (Pilot Projects on Performance Based Teacher Education). Newsletter of the Education Improvement Center, New Haven, Connecticut.

Florida: Performance Based Teacher Certification: Florida Project Program, State Department of Education, January, 1972.

Georgia: Development of a Long Range Plan for Achieving Competency-Based Education and Certification, Georgia Department of Education, 1973.

Illinois: Bakalis, Michael J., Report of the Task Force on Certification, Springfield: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972.

Louisiana: Delee, James and Gilbert Browning, A Model for Competency Based Teacher Education, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, 1973.

Maryland: Competency Based Teacher Education and Certification (A summary of six staff development seminars on Competency-Based Education, 1972-73), in press.

Michigan: Pfau, Edward, Competent Performance In Teacher Education, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, 1970.

Minnesota: Professions Development Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 1 and 2, Minnesota State Department of Education.

New Jersey: Roth, Robert, Performance-Based Teacher Certification: A Survey of the States, New Jersey State Department of Education, December, 1972.

Roth, Robert, The Role of the State In Performance-Based Teacher Education/Certification, New Jersey State Department of Education, December, 1972.

New Mexico: Interim Report On Competency Based Certification, State Department of Education, Sante Fe, 1973.

New York: A New Style of Certification, New York State Department of Education, 1972. CBE (Competency-Based Certification) Newsletter of the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification.

North Carolina: Freeman, J.P., Strategy for Improving Teacher Education in North Carolina, State Department of Education, Raleigh, 1971.
Standards and Guidelines for the Approval of Institutions and Programs for Teacher Education: "Competency-Based Program," State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Teacher Education, Raleigh: September, 1972.

Oregon: Process Standards and Guidelines for Competency-Based Educational Personnel Development Programs, Oregon Board of Education, Salem, 1972.

Pennsylvania: Teacher Education Memoranda (Series of publication, many dealing with CBE) Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, Office of the Secretary of Education, Harrisburg, 1972-73.

Texas: Texas Standards for Teacher Education and Certification, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1972.

Utah: Recommendations of the Designing Education for the Future Committee, State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, 1971.

Vermont: Vail, Robert, Bissex and Carl English, Questions and Answers About Local Certification, State Department of Education, 1973.

Washington: A New Approach to Teacher Education and Teacher Certification, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Olympia, 1972.

Agencies Working on CBTE

The National Commission on Performance-Based Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, Frederick McDonald, Director.

The Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036, Karl Massanari, Director.

The Multi-States Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12210, Theodore Andrews, Director.

The National Consortium of CBE Centers, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, Norman Dodl, Director.

The Southern Consortium, North Carolina Centeral University, Durham, North Carolina 27707, Norman Johnson, Director.

The "Teacher Center" Leadership Training Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620, B. Othanel Smith, Director.

The Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education Task Force '72 "Outside Track", Office of the Graduate School, City University of New York, New York, 10018, Benjamin Rosner, Director.

National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems/Teacher Corps, United States Office of Education, FOB #6, Room 4171, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20020, Allen Schmieder, Director.

Rhode Island Teacher Center, Roger Williams Building, Hayes Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908, Kenneth Mellor, Director.